United Nations

FCCC/SBI/2015/4

Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.: General
5 May 2015

Original: English

Subsidiary Body for Implementation
Forty-second session
Bonn, 1–11 June 2015

Item 9(a) and (b) of the provisional agenda
Capacity-building
Capacity-building under the Convention
Capacity-building under the Kyoto Protocol

Synthesis report on the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries

Note by the secretariat*

Summary

This report has been prepared to support the Subsidiary Body for Implementation in its annual monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries in accordance with decisions 2/CP.7 and 29/CMP.1. The report draws on information synthesized from national communications, biennial update reports, biennial reports, the 2014 annual report of the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, the 2014 annual report of the Nairobi Framework Partnership, and annual submissions from Parties. Information is presented according to the scope of needs and priority areas for capacity-building in developing countries outlined in decision 2/CP.7. This report may assist Parties in reviewing the progress made in the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries and identifying ways to further enhance the delivery of capacity-building support to developing countries.

* This document was submitted after the due date owing to the delayed submission of views and information by Parties.

GE.15-08955 (E)

1508955

Please recycle

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Introduction	1–66	3
	A. Mandate and scope of the report	1–7	3
	B. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation	8	4
	C. Overview of information reported and submitted by Parties	9–14	4
	D. Information on activities addressing needs and priority areas identified in the capacity-building framework	15–66	5
II.	Summary of issues raised in submissions from Parties	67–71	14
III.	Capacity-building activities under the Kyoto Protocol	72–75	15

I. Introduction

A. Mandate and scope of the report

1. The Conference of the Parties (COP), by its decisions 2/CP.7 and 4/CP.12, requested the secretariat to produce annually a synthesis report on activities undertaken to implement the framework for capacity-building in developing countries (hereinafter referred to as the capacity-building framework).

2. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP), by its decisions 29/CMP.1 and 6/CMP.2, requested the secretariat to take into account, in its annual synthesis report, capacity-building activities relating to the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol in developing countries.

3. In accordance with decision 1/CP.18,[1] the synthesis report, contained in this document, is made available to the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) at its sessions coinciding with the meetings of the Durban Forum on capacity-building.[2]

4. This synthesis report summarizes available information on the extent of the implementation of the capacity-building framework. The information refers to activities reported between January and December 2014, and, owing to the reporting cycle, is mostly drawn from national reports submitted by Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Parties)[3] as well as late submissions of national reports from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention (Annex I Parties).[4] The 2014 annual report of the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM) to the CMP (part I)[5] and the 2014 annual report of the Nairobi Framework Partnership[6] have also been considered in the summary of capacity-building activities undertaken under the Kyoto Protocol.

5. Submissions on the capacity-building of three groups of Parties[7] have been taken into account in the preparation of this report. Information submitted by United Nations organizations and other institutions is available in the addendum to this report.[8]

6. This report presents information according to the scope of needs and the priority areas for capacity-building in developing countries outlined in the capacity-building framework.[9] It summarizes the support provided by developed country Parties to developing country Parties and highlights barriers and constraints to the implementation of the capacity-building framework. Given that several non-Annex I Parties submitted their first biennial update reports (BURs) by December 2014, information on capacity-building activities undertaken and barriers and constraints encountered in the process of the preparation of BURs has been summarized under the priority area 'national communications'.

---

[1] Decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 78.
[2] See decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 144.
[3] Fourteen national communications and ten biennial update reports.
[4] Seven national communications and seven biennial reports.
[5] FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/5.
[6] See <https://cdm.unfccc.int/Nairobi_Framework/index.html>.
[7] FCCC/SBI/2015/MISC.1. Submissions are also available at <http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/SitePages/sessions.aspx?showOnlyCurrentCalls=1&populateData=1&expectedsubmissionfrom=Parties&focalBodies=SBI>.
[8] FCCC/SBI/2015/4/Add.1.
[9] Decision 2/CP.7, annex, paragraph 15.

7. As further work may have been undertaken after the submission of the source documents, the synthesis of information contained in this report may not convey the complete picture. There may also be gaps in areas where information was unavailable.

B. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

8. The SBI may wish to use the information contained in this report to:

(a) Undertake the annual monitoring of the implementation of the capacity-building framework;

(b) Facilitate discussions at the 4th meeting of the Durban Forum on capacity-building, which will coincide with SBI 42;[10]

(c) Determine any further steps to support enhanced action on capacity-building.

C. Overview of information reported and submitted by Parties

9. Information on capacity-building reported and submitted by Parties during the period from January to December 2014 covers all the priority areas identified in the capacity-building framework. In comparison with last year's synthesis report,[11] enhanced reporting is noted in the areas of institutional capacity-building, national communications (NCs), national climate change programmes, greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories and assessment for implementation of mitigation options.

10. In their NCs and/or BURs, all non-Annex I Parties reported a wide variety of efforts undertaken to enhance the capacity at institutional, systemic and individual levels in order to mitigate and adapt to climate change. Information on capacity-building activities supported by Annex I Parties was also covered. Some non-Annex I Parties included detailed information in their BURs on support received through bilateral and multilateral channels in tables referring to technical and capacity-building needs. Reporting on capacity-building support delivered through technical assistance projects, programmes and partnerships in the context of South–South cooperation, in particular in the areas of development and transfer of technology, training, knowledge sharing and networking, also increased.

11. The process of the preparation of NCs and BURs facilitated the identification of barriers to the implementation of the capacity-building framework. All non-Annex I Parties that submitted national reports in 2014 identified the lack of financial resources as the most crucial barrier to the implementation of capacity-building action. This barrier impeded actions to create and/or maintain a robust institutional structure responsible for the design, planning and implementation of climate change policies and regulatory frameworks; to train managerial staff to facilitate the implementation of such frameworks and identify bilateral and multilateral agencies for cooperation and partnerships; and to train national experts to enhance their sectoral scientific and technical knowledge. Other barriers identified by non-Annex I Parties were, among others, obsolete national policies, legal and institutional frameworks; insufficient awareness and expertise of decision makers on climate change related issues; and a limited number of qualified experts.

12. Several non-Annex I Parties highlighted their interest in exploring technical cooperation opportunities on planning and implementing projects in the area of sustainable cities, transport and urban mobility, a topic widely covered under the technical expert

[10] Decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 78.
[11] FCCC/SBI/2014/2.

meeting[12] in June 2014 under the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action.

13. All Annex I Parties included in their NCs and biennial reports (BRs) information on capacity-building support provided to developing countries. Examples of such support in BRs are contained not only in table 9, "Provision of capacity-building support", but also in table 7(b), "Provision of public financial support: contribution through bilateral, regional and other channels", and in table 8, "Provision of technology development and transfer support". Some Annex I Parties pointed out that projects included in table 9 are just a small selection of supported activities with a specific focus on capacity-building, because the latter is embedded in many other projects. One Annex I Party indicated that technology transfer and capacity-building activities are described under the same heading, as it is often difficult to distinguish between the two, and one activity often involves the other.

14. In general, Annex I Parties underlined the importance of a country-driven bottom-up approach to organizing capacity-building support, based on national needs and priorities of developing countries. They also stated that capacity-building is a joint learning process owned and operated nationally but taking place in partnership between developing and developed countries. Some Annex I Parties gave priority to building the capacity of countries and regions where poverty is directly linked to the deterioration of natural resources, environmental degradation and natural disasters.

D. Information on activities addressing needs and priority areas identified in the capacity-building framework

1. Institutional capacity-building, including the strengthening or establishment, as appropriate, of national climate change secretariats or national focal points

15. Most non-Annex I Parties reported on the establishment or strengthening of domestic institutional arrangements to support the planning and implementation of policies and measures for climate change mitigation and adaptation at all levels of governmental jurisdiction – national, state or provincial, and municipal. From this reported data, the following trends emerged:

(a) Dedicated national institutions were tasked to ensure the effective coordination between central and local authorities and the engagement of non-State actors; to integrate climate change related issues in strategies and plans of governmental agencies; and to design, implement, monitor and evaluate climate change programmes;

(b) Government officials were appointed in relevant ministries as climate change focal points and dedicated authorities were established, including designated national authorities (DNAs) for the CDM, national designated entities (NDEs) for the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN), and designated authorities for the Adaptation Fund. Training courses for the staff of these authorities were organized to expand their knowledge on specific climate change related issues;

(c) Linkages were strengthened with national committees on biodiversity and desertification to promote synergies and harmonization of policies and strategies.

16. Establishing and strengthening institutional arrangements still posed challenges in several developing countries. The absence of incentives and adequate funds to ensure the development and implementation of robust institutional arrangements was one of the major obstacles reported by some non-Annex I Parties. Coordination between governmental agencies needed to be improved to avoid the overlap of roles and responsibilities or to

[12] See <http://unfccc.int/bodies/awg/items/8170.php>.

prevent conflicts among ministries considering specific areas as being under their sole jurisdiction. Increasing the interactions between central governments and subnational entities was also a challenge. The insufficient capacity of institutions to ensure effective coordination was often caused by high staff turnover. Non-Annex I Parties also noted that the successful development and implementation of policies and plans of climate change institutions was hindered by the shortage of professionals with sectoral mitigation and adaptation expertise.

17. Several Annex I Parties reported on facilitating training courses and knowledge transfer on climate change related issues, including environmentally sustainable energy solutions, renewable energy, energy efficiency, sustainable urban planning and eco-buildings, for government officials at the national and municipal levels.

2. Enhancement and/or creation of an enabling environment

18. Many non-Annex I Parties reported having adopted national environmental policies and regulatory frameworks that incorporated climate change considerations and contributed to mainstreaming climate change issues in national planning and budgeting. Such policies provided a basis for programmes and action plans fostering sustainable development. One non-Annex I Party mentioned, among the measures undertaken to mitigate climate change, the introduction of a carbon tax on fossil fuels from stationary combustion sources in 2014.

19. Some non-Annex I Parties are still working towards putting regulatory frameworks in place to improve the coordination among national bodies in their approach to addressing climate change. Notwithstanding climate change being mentioned in the national legislation, there was still a need to adopt appropriate guidelines for long-term sustainable planning of environmental sectoral policies, strategies or action plans for green growth, a low-emission economy and resilience to climate change. Some of these Parties saw a need to adopt a finance policy to ensure that financial and other resources were allocated to, and utilized for, climate change related activities.

20. Several Annex I Parties reported having provided support to developing countries to create or strengthen enabling environments and improve legislative frameworks, including those for attracting private sector investments for green economic growth.

3. National communications

21. Several non-Annex I Parties reported having institutional arrangements in place to coordinate their activities, promote synergies and avoid the duplication of efforts in the preparation of NCs. Relevant institutions were created or appointed to work on specific chapters of NCs, such as GHG inventories; vulnerability and adaptation assessments; identification of mitigation options; and education, training and public awareness. A few non-Annex I Parties underlined the importance of a transparent and participatory approach to the preparation of NCs, based on collaboration among all stakeholders, including governmental and private institutions, academia and civil society.

22. Many non-Annex I Parties pointed out that the preparation of BURs required greater effort and capacity in comparison with those needed for the preparation of NCs. Some non-Annex I Parties stated that existing institutional arrangements were no longer appropriate and suitable to meet the new reporting requirements under the Convention. Other non-Annex I Parties described in their BURs the process of reviewing the existing set-up in order to implement a more robust system allowing them to meet the reporting obligations.

23. Some non-Annex I Parties acknowledged technical assistance through the provision of training materials and the organization of workshops by the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention in the preparation of their first BURs. One non-Annex I Party reported that the

preparation of some chapters of its BUR was outsourced, and stated that the request for financial support to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for the BUR preparation remained unanswered.

24. The development and implementation of robust institutional arrangements for the preparation of NCs and BURs were reported as important issues for many non-Annex I Parties. A stable and permanent institutional arrangement was necessary for defining regulatory and technical frameworks at the national level to facilitate the preparation of NCs and BURs as well as intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs). The establishment of permanent systems for measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) of mitigation actions and other activities relating to the Convention was also considered of key importance. The provision of training and technical assistance on quality control, documentation and archiving, among others, was listed among the needs to be met. Some non-Annex I Parties stated that funds received from the GEF may not be sufficient to cover all the expenditures linked to the strengthening and maintenance of a robust, effective and efficient institutional arrangement for producing high-quality BURs and NCs on a regular basis.

25. A group of Parties acknowledged in their submission the work of the National Communications Support Programme funded through the GEF.

4. National climate change programmes

26. According to the information contained in NCs and BURs submitted by non-Annex I Parties, national climate change programmes or strategies were approved by many non-Annex I Parties in line with their national priorities. In some cases, cross-cutting issues such as environmental protection, sustainable management and utilization of natural resources or socioeconomic development were also included in national climate change programmes.

27. Several non-Annex I Parties reviewed and revised their national action programmes to reflect current and evolving issues relating to climate change at the local, national and international levels. One non-Annex I Party included capacity-building next to adaptation and mitigation as one of the main priorities of its national climate change plan of action.

28. Specific national plans targeted gender issues in the areas of building the adaptive capacity of women and men in their communities, increasing the resilience to climate change of vulnerable sectors, and optimizing mitigation opportunities towards a gender-responsive and human rights-based approach to sustainable development.

29. A few non-Annex I Parties reported the difficulty in mainstreaming climate change considerations in national strategies for sustainable development because of the insufficient sensitivity of policymakers towards climate change issues and the lack of awareness raising campaigns. Conflicting national priorities posed an additional challenge in this area: fighting poverty can divert attention away from addressing climate change. In this context, raising awareness among decision makers on the interlinkages between poverty, food security and climate change was important. The implementation of national plans could be facilitated if more financial resources were allocated to training on effective project management and MRV procedures.

5. Greenhouse gas inventories, emission database management, and systems for collecting, managing and utilizing activity data and emission factors

30. Very few non-Annex I Parties reported having a national GHG inventory system, which sets out institutional, legal and procedural measures to ensure the continuous and regular update of national GHG inventories, the consistency of reported GHG flows and the quality of results. The preparation of training materials targeting each sector, including a

step-by-step explanation of the process for completing inventory tables, and examples of good practices, data sources and emission factors was crucial in order to build the capacity of national experts and establish a GHG inventory team. Some non-Annex I Parties mentioned specific training courses and hands-on experience with inventory review materials for national experts who were eventually nominated to the UNFCCC roster of experts for reviewing inventories of Annex I Parties.

31. All non-Annex I Parties identified constraints limiting or negatively impacting on the periodic preparation of a national inventory of GHG emissions. These constraints include:

(a) The absence of a national GHG inventory system and a GHG inventory unit responsible for the compilation of data;

(b) Unavailability of end-use consumption data for different sectors and categories, which needs to be generated on the basis of other scientific and consumption parameters;

(c) Inconsistencies in data collected from different sources;

(d) A lack of permanent and qualified personnel to prepare sectoral inventories;

(e) Unavailability of an integrated information technology system for housing, storing and retrieving data;

(f) Scarce capacity to measure and quantify GHG mitigation programmes and projects at the local and regional levels;

(g) Insufficient quality assurance and quality control procedures.

32. Some of the recommendations for future improvement in this area are:

(a) Developing local and subnational inventories and specific emission factors;

(b) Establishing a national reporting system for GHG emissions by specific sectors;

(c) Developing a forestry inventory to attain greater precision in the estimates of GHG emissions from land use, land-use change and forestry.

33. A group of Annex I Parties reported on the support provided to developing countries through the World Resources Institute GHG Protocol standards, an initiative aiming at facilitating the establishment of robust accounting and reporting for GHG mitigation actions and programmes.

6. Vulnerability and adaptation assessment

34. Several non-Annex I Parties reported good progress in this area mainly thanks to technology transfer cooperation to improve vulnerability assessments. The development of national adaptation programmes of action played a pivotal role in addressing urgent assessment needs at the national level. Training and participatory planning to conduct land use and water resources assessments fostered sustainable land and water management practices. Such initiatives contributed to generating higher awareness of climate change issues in communities living in areas affected by extreme weather variability.

35. Barriers to the implementation of vulnerability and adaptation assessments identified by many non-Annex I Parties include:

(a) Poor coordination between central governments and subnational authorities;

(b) Shortage of qualified and trained personnel, especially in monitoring and data-processing technologies;

(c) Outdated climate and impact models hampering the work on key risks and impacts. Training is also needed to develop, update and downscale climate change scenarios as the basis for assessment of climate change impacts.

36. Several Annex I Parties reported having supported training on vulnerability assessments and human security in relation to extreme climate events.

7. Capacity-building for implementation of adaptation measures

37. All non-Annex I Parties reported in their submitted NCs on efforts to build the capacity at the institutional, systemic and individual levels to implement adaptation measures. Many of these Parties emphasized the benefits gained through bilateral and multilateral cooperation in this area. Training programmes, including training of trainers, were conducted to enhance the professional expertise required for the integration of climate-resilient development concepts into national and municipal strategies and plans. One Party highlighted the value of building on indigenous knowledge to design adaptation actions, taking into account the local knowledge of elders, religious leaders and individuals with different roles, including gender, within the communities.

38. The need to integrate climate change adaptation into strategic planning oriented towards sustainable development and poverty reduction was one of the most frequent recommendations provided by non-Annex I Parties in their reports. Other recommendations included:

(a) Strengthening the capacity of national and local institutions in managing climate risks through the development of appropriate regulatory frameworks and effective climate information systems;

(b) Developing and diffusing adaptation technologies and innovations;

(c) Enhancing the communication on climate risk management and effective adaptation strategies among researchers, producers and policymakers.

39. Some Annex I Parties reported on capacity-building support provided to developing countries to implement measures to introduce climate-smart agriculture, improve natural resource management, enhance disaster risk reduction and preparedness, and ensure food security.

8. Assessment for implementation of mitigation options

40. The majority of non-Annex I Parties provided information on the institutional arrangements in place and efforts undertaken by governmental agencies to design and implement mitigation policies and measures, including nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs), in several sectors.

41. Nevertheless, developing and implementing NAMAs was a challenge for some non-Annex I Parties, which ascribed the limited utilization of environmentally sound technologies to weak institutional arrangements and inadequate national and sectoral policies. The absence of MRV procedures and a system to track co-benefits in the wider context of sustainable development also impeded the development of NAMAs in some non-Annex I Parties. While some non-Annex I Parties were working on the development, establishment and implementation of NAMA MRV systems, other non-Annex I Parties counted on assistance from bilateral and multilateral agencies to build capacity for the creation of an MRV system for domestically supported NAMAs. Training in systems analysis and computer simulation modelling; building institutional, administrative and regulatory frameworks; and establishing other mechanisms for information collection, monitoring and sharing were among capacity-building needs reported by several non-Annex I Parties.

42. Annex I Parties reported having focused their support in this area on building the capacity of developing countries to:

(a) Strengthen institutional arrangements, including REDD-plus[13] governance;

(b) Enhance regulatory frameworks enabling legal reforms;

(c) Establish monitoring and reporting systems;

(d) Create incentives for private sector investments in green economic development. Annex I Parties also mentioned their support to developing countries in the preparation of INDCs.

9. Research and systematic observation, including meteorological, hydrological and climatological services

43. Very few non-Annex I Parties reported on this priority area. Meteorology departments providing services related to research and systematic observation in non-Annex I Parties were faced with the challenge of finding high-quality historic and real time quality data, information, and products. One non-Annex I Party reported on its participation in a research programme on predicting future climate scenarios and their impact on people and ecosystems. Such scenarios had to be taken into consideration in the formulation of national development plans.

44. While the lack of skilled manpower was identified as one of the main capacity gaps in this area, filling this gap through specialized training in conducting research and applying modern technology for meteorological forecasts, warnings and observations was often a problem due to scarce financial resources. One non-Annex I Party mentioned the need to develop a national research programme on climate change, while another non-Annex I Party observed that the limited availability of climatological data was the result of the closure of many national weather stations.

45. A few Annex I Parties reported on their efforts to strengthen cooperation between their national institutions, universities and agencies engaged in research projects on climate change related topics and respective academic institutions in developing countries.

10. Development and transfer of technology

46. Some non-Annex I Parties provided information on the institutional arrangements in place for overseeing the acquisition, promotion and development of clean technologies at the national level. The appointment of NDEs and the training provided to their staff represented an important step for these Parties in ensuring access to support offered by the CTCN in fostering climate technology transfer. Several programmes were established to provide incentives to producers and developers of environmentally sound technologies and to strengthen the competitiveness of industries through the adoption of cleaner production technologies.

47. Enhanced support to accelerate the transfer of environmentally sound technologies for both adaptation and mitigation was requested by the majority of non-Annex I Parties. Attention was drawn to the need for more training activities on available environmentally sound technologies and their benefits. The promotion of public–private partnerships in developing and using new climate-friendly technologies was one of the recommendations made in the national reports. Barriers to technology development and transfer identified by

[13] In decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, the COP encouraged developing country Parties to contribute to mitigation actions in the forest sector by undertaking the following activities: reducing emissions from deforestation; reducing emissions from forest degradation; conservation of forest carbon stocks; sustainable management of forests; and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

non-Annex I Parties included the lack of mechanisms and policies to encourage investments in clean technologies and the absence of provisions to retain technical expertise within ministries.

48. Nearly all Annex I Parties reported on initiatives and programmes undertaken bilaterally or multilaterally to build the capacity required for technology transfer to, and among, developing countries. Their support was centred on improving the technological expertise and regulatory frameworks of recipient countries so as to enhance the deployment of clean energy technologies and promote near- and long-term global economic and social stability. Some Annex I Parties also highlighted their role as information and technology providers which enable interactions with financial institutions and technology networks.

11. Improved decision-making, including assistance for participation in international negotiations

49. Very few non-Annex I Parties reported on actions taken to improve decision-making, as it was generally covered under bilateral cooperation programmes in other climate change related areas.

50. On the other hand, many non-Annex I Parties underscored the need to enhance the knowledge of policymakers on climate change and related cross-cutting issues, which were at the top of the agenda in developing countries, such as poverty, food security, health and extreme weather events. An enhanced awareness of climate change issues would bring about better coordination of policies and strategies. One non-Annex I Party noted that governmental institutions should take steps to translate the outcomes of intergovernmental climate change negotiations into targeted national strategies on climate change.

51. One Annex I Party reported on initiatives undertaken to empower decision makers from developing countries to stay up-to-date on the information and tools required to improve the policy environment for the promotion of clean energy. Another Annex I Party reported on training organized to strengthen the capacity of climate change negotiators from developing countries on specific agenda items discussed within the UNFCCC negotiations.

12. Clean development mechanism

52. Several non-Annex I Parties reported that they considered the CDM as an opportunity to contribute to climate change mitigation and benefit from clean technologies. Information was provided on the capacity built to establish institutional arrangements, including the appointment of DNAs; create an enabling environment; and train local experts with a view to promoting CDM project activities and raising awareness of CDM benefits. National CDM policy guidelines were prepared to help administer, manage, facilitate and control national CDM processes. Capacity-building initiatives undertaken under the United Nations Development Programme Low Emission Capacity Building Programme facilitated the implementation of CDM project activities, particularly in Africa. One non-Annex I Party planned to develop a coordinated policy approach for mitigation that integrates CDM project activities, NAMAs, MRV, low emission development strategies and INDCs. A project strengthening the capacity of institutions and stakeholders to implement CDM programmes of activities (PoAs) and post-2012 carbon market mechanisms, including the reformed CDM, was launched in the Pacific region.

53. Some non-Annex I Parties continued to stress the need to increase decision makers' awareness of the financial and environmental benefits of the CDM. Some of these Parties noted that capacity-building for technology development and transfer in the CDM context was more successful when a subsidiary of a company from a developed country was involved.

54. Several Annex I Parties reported having organized training courses for developing countries focusing on CDM project development, including methodological and legal aspects. Furthermore, one Annex I Party mentioned a successful bilateral cooperation initiative to promote bioenergy through CDM project activities.

13. Needs arising out of the implementation of Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention

55. Many of the least developed countries (LDCs) reported on their active involvement in a considerable number of sustainable development programmes with climate change related components being implemented by the international community. Several of the LDCs reported having institutional and regulatory frameworks in place to enable the implementation of climate change related activities at the national and local levels. Non-State actors, including national non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and research and educational institutions played a crucial role in enhancing public awareness on the importance of the planning and implementation of adaptation actions. Another example of a reported multi-stakeholder initiative was the organization of training on climate-related disaster prevention measures, including self-monitoring of early warning systems at the community and neighbourhood levels.

56. Many of the LDCs noted that submitted national reports were a means to communicate their capacity needs with regard to the implementation of both adaptation and mitigation measures. Such needs included, for example, building national capacity to develop country-specific emission factors for GHG inventories and for measurement and quantification of GHG mitigation programmes and projects. One of the LDCs underlined that a single development agency could not provide comprehensive support, therefore concerted efforts by all stakeholders would be necessary to make progress in implementing climate change actions. To this end, capacity development targeting professional staff and local community members should be continuously assessed and improved. The same Party identified a three pillar model based on skills and knowledge, systems and processes, attitudes and behaviours, to use as a starting point to prepare a comprehensive institutional capacity development plan, which would be periodically reviewed and revised based on lessons learned.

57. The majority of the LDCs benefitted from South–South cooperation initiatives in terms of exchange of experiences, training courses and workshops on climate change related issues. Singapore and the Republic of Korea were among the leading non-Annex I Parties offering technical assistance and capacity-building programmes to the LDCs and other developing countries, particularly in Africa and South-East Asia.

58. Most Annex I Parties underlined in their national reports their commitment to provide capacity-building support to the LDCs either through bilateral cooperation or in partnership with relevant organizations. Capacity-building in the LDCs to promote sustainable land management and address desertification and land degradation was at the top of the agenda of many Annex I Parties, together with enabling activities relating to biodiversity conservation, soil quality, and food and water security.

14. Education, training and public awareness

59. The tendency among non-Annex I Parties to increase the amount of information on the implementation of Article 6 of the Convention in national reports continued in 2014, thus highlighting the importance that Parties attach to education, training, public awareness, public access to information and public participation in climate change decision-making and action. Many non-Annex I Parties reported on their efforts to build national educational, scientific and technical capacity at all levels and on enhanced cooperation on

education, training and public awareness between government institutions and other stakeholders, namely NGOs and the private sector.

60. As regards to formal education programmes, one non-Annex I Party reported the involvement of the United Nations Children's Fund in developing school curricula with a focus on environmental topics. Some non-Annex I Parties reported that teachers required access to knowledge products including teaching manuals and environmental education materials. One Party reported having integrated elements of disaster preparedness and management in schools' programmes to enable children to better cope with the consequences of extreme climatic events and protect their lives. Non-formal education conducted through training courses, seminars and workshops was focused mainly on issues relating to land conservation, reforestation, fire protection and biodiversity conservation.

61. Some non-Annex I Parties observed that the concept of climate change education for sustainable development was still relatively new, which explained the considerable lack of awareness of the interrelated nature of all human activities and the environment. Despite the introduction in some countries of environmental education at the primary, secondary and university levels, there was still a need to refine and enhance the content of the information and communication messages and materials for the public. These Parties were aware of the need to increase public sensitivity to environmental and developmental problems. This would help to foster a sense of personal environmental responsibility and a greater commitment towards sustainable development policies and actions. Where possible, public awareness activities were conducted using a combination of the media and communication materials tailored to a target audience. However, the implementation of ad hoc awareness-raising initiatives was impeded by the lack of human and financial resources.

62. Non-Annex I Parties recognized the crucial role of NGOs and international development agencies in supporting the implementation of Article 6 related activities, including language courses to improve staff capacity to communicate with their international counterparts.

63. Several Annex I Parties highlighted initiatives and cooperation programmes aimed at promoting the training of experts and policymakers in developing countries. Such initiatives included one-to-one training, online learning modules and long-distance courses with the involvement of universities and research institutions. One Annex I Party reported on the organization of a lecture series on climate change governance delivered by internationally renowned experts from the academic and policy areas targeting the public at large in developing countries.

15. Information and networking, including the establishment of databases

64. Many non-Annex I Parties increased their efforts in the production of resource materials in order to enhance the dissemination of climate change related information and improve networking at the national, subnational and community levels. In several countries, the creation of centralized data and information sharing centres, especially in the area of meteorology, also contributed to enhancing knowledge on specific aspects of climate change.

65. Some non-Annex I Parties advocated the need to support this area through the provision of adequate financial resources for research and training in order to build institutional and administrative capacity at all levels, including technical and legislative aspects and mechanisms for information collection, monitoring and sharing.

66. Annex I Parties mentioned their support to the Ibero-American Network of Climate Change Offices initiative, which aims to promote dialogue and exchange of experiences and information on climate change policies, activities and projects among the Ibero-

American countries, identifying needs and priorities for adaptation and mitigation. Another initiative reported by Annex I Parties is the Regional Gateway for Technology Transfer and Climate Change Action in Latin America and the Caribbean, which aims to strengthen capacity and knowledge-sharing on climate change technologies and experiences for adaptation and mitigation in the region.

II. Summary of issues raised in submissions from Parties

67. The issues relating to the implementation of the capacity-building framework raised in the submissions of three groups of Parties (referred to in para. 5 above) are summarized in paragraphs 68–71 below.

68. A group of Parties considered that:

(a) The scope of capacity-building needs, as contained in the capacity-building framework, remains relevant;

(b) Capacity-building is foundational and Parties have to acquire capacity before they can mitigate, adapt, develop and implement economically and financially viable projects, and develop, deploy, transfer and apply environmentally sound technologies;

(c) Since 1992, capacity-building support has been delivered on an ad hoc basis and tied to specific projects with a time-bound component, without creating a sustainable long-term structure;

(d) Meetings of the Durban Forum on capacity-building confirm that capacity-building remains an issue for developing countries;

(e) The treatment of capacity-building as a cross-cutting issue is flawed;

(f) While ad hoc capacity-building activities are conducted by bodies established under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol and by bilateral and multilateral agencies, these activities are not monitored, measured and verified globally. This is owing to the lack of an internationally agreed baseline as well as targets and indicators to use in measuring capacity-building progress and to the absence of a dedicated body responsible for the oversight of capacity-building activities.

69. To address the concerns listed in paragraph 68 above, this group of Parties recommended the establishment of a capacity-building coordination committee to coordinate the implementation of the capacity-building framework pursuant to decisions 2/CP.7, 2/CP.10 and 29/CMP 1. Such a committee would lead the comprehensive review of the implementation of the capacity-building framework, the organization of meetings of the Durban Forum on capacity-building, and the MRV of capacity-building activities conducted nationally and internationally.

70. Another group of Parties stated that:

(a) It supports efforts to enhance capacities to address climate change in the broader context of sustainable development in developing countries across all regions and sectors of the economy and at the regional, national and subnational levels;

(b) Capacity-building is fundamental to enable the full, effective and sustained implementation of the Convention. It is by nature a cross-cutting issue, therefore a strong capacity-building element should be a substantial and integral part of all development activities, including those that aim to enhance mitigation and adaptation actions and facilitate access to support in developing countries;

(c) Capacity-building is not based on a global top-down approach, but builds on a bottom-up approach taking into account each country's situation and linking capacity-building to context-specific needs and challenges;

(d) Financial and technical support aimed at building capacities is provided through various channels, including bilateral, multilateral and private sector cooperation, and combined with relevant qualitative and quantitative methods for monitoring its impact, when appropriate;

(e) The Convention and its Kyoto Protocol have an appropriate arrangement to deal with and guide capacity-building issues. The capacity-building framework with its rolling review system and annual submissions on its implementation form the cornerstones of Parties' capacity-building activities and guide the work of the Financial Mechanism of the Convention. Capacity-building is a standing agenda item under the COP, the CMP and the SBI, providing possibilities for annual guidance on capacity-building activities. The Durban Forum on capacity-building provides a space for annual in-depth discussions on capacity-building by sharing experiences and exchanging ideas, best practices and lessons learned regarding the implementation of capacity-building activities;

(f) Several bodies established under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol provide capacity-building support to developing countries. The effectiveness of capacity-building can be enhanced through the collaboration and coordination of these bodies.

71. A group of Parties regarded capacity-building as a key component of the means of implementation in developing countries and a prerequisite for the implementation of the Convention. The group emphasized that the effectiveness of any adaptation and mitigation efforts by developing countries is a function of the level of capacity of Parties and stressed the need for adequate support for capacity-building.

III. Capacity-building activities under the Kyoto Protocol

72. The CDM Executive Board, in its role as the regulatory body of the CDM, continued in 2014 to undertake measures and initiatives to promote and enhance the regional and subregional distribution of CDM project activities.

73. The Board continued providing assistance to DNAs through help desks, regional training events, DNA Forum meetings, regional workshops, monitoring of sustainable development benefits from CDM project activities and PoAs, and development of guidelines for local stakeholder consultations.

74. CDM project development support was mostly led by the regional collaboration centres (RCCs), established in 2013 by the secretariat to operate in partnership with local and regional agencies and multilateral development banks. The RCCs were designated to support existing projects, actualize the CDM project cycle under PoAs, develop standardized baselines together with a pipeline of future projects, and broaden knowledge related to the CDM. The four established centres[14] provided direct support to project participants involved in hundreds of existing project activities, resulting in some of these activities moving forward in the project cycle. The centres were also active in identifying new project activities, some of which moved through the CDM pipeline as a result of follow-up actions. Furthermore, the presence of the RCCs on the ground helped to catalyse action by several international and regional agencies. Several partnerships and

[14] RCCs have been established in Lomé, Togo, in collaboration with the Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement; Kampala, Uganda, in collaboration with the East African Development Bank; St. George's, Grenada, in collaboration with the Windward Islands Research and Education Foundation; and Bogota, Colombia, in collaboration with the Banco de Desarrollo de América Latina.

collaboration schemes were established with the effect of strengthening the impact of all agencies on the ground, facilitating interaction with local governments, monitoring results and allowing for follow-up.

75. In the context of the Nairobi Framework Partnership,[15] launched in December 2006 by the then United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, to spread the benefits of the CDM, especially in sub-Saharan Africa, efforts were focused in 2014 on capacity-building for a range of stakeholders and support for project development. Project development support was led by the secretariat's RCCs with contributions from partner organizations, including the Asian Development Bank, the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Environment Programme/Technical University of Denmark Partnership.[16] Capacity-building activities covered DNAs, coordinating and managing entities of PoAs, project developers and other stakeholders, through in-person workshops and events. Distance learning through webinars and e-courses also had a high profile during this period. Assistance in developing PoAs and standardized baselines was the main area of support.

---

[15] See <https://cdm.unfccc.int/about/Nairobi_Framework/index.html>.

[16] Formerly the United Nations Environment Programme Risoe Centre.